DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 443 CG 022 765

AUTHOR Rice, Robert; Thomas, William
TITLE The Effects of Various Types of Orientation Programming upon Freshman Academic Performance and Reaction to College.
PUB DATE Jan 89
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Western Regional Conference of the Freshman Year Experience (Irvine, CA, January 29-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; College Faculty; *College Freshmen; Educational Counseling; Higher Education; Program Effectiveness; *School Orientation; Student School Relationship; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

A quasi-experimental design using four matched groups of 88 students each of entering college freshmen investigated the question of whether increasing exposure to different types of orientation programming would have any effect upon freshman academic performance and reaction to college. The types of orientation included: (1) traditional orientation with fall term pre-registration orientation program; (2) fall and summer orientation program; (3) fall and summer orientation and first term of an extended course taught by underclassmen; and (4) fall and summer orientation, first term of the extended course and a one-credit hour university seminar course. Results indicated that freshmen who participated in each of the four types of orientation programming did not differ significantly on the 19 subcategories of the Student Reaction to College Survey. However, individual analysis of the items showed that students who participated in all four orientation programs were significantly more involved with faculty, were more informed about their progress in courses, reacted more favorably to registration, and were less likely to drop classes than were students in other orientation groups. However, students with full exposure to orientation programming expressed greater dissatisfaction with the quality of student/faculty interaction and were significantly more critical of the supportive aspects of the college and faculty. (Author/ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323443

The Effects of Various Types of Orientation Programming Upon Freshman Academic Performance and Reaction to College

A Paper Presented at the Western Regional Conference of the Freshman Year Experience
Irvine, California

Robert Rice
Oregon State University

William Thomas
Oregon State University

CG 022765

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Rice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

I. Abstract....2

II. Introduction....3

III. Methodology....3

IV. Findings of the Study....5
A Group Comparison on the 19 SRC Sub-Categories....5
Summary of Sub-Category Findings....6
A Group Comparison on the Specific Items of the SRC....6
Summary of Group Differences Within SRC Items....7
Significant SRC Item Differences Between Groups....7
Summary of Traditional vs. Summer Programs....8
Summary of HIED 101x vs. Traditional\Summer Programs..9
Summary of HIED 101x vs. Traditional Programs....9
Summary of HIED 102x vs. Traditional Programs....10
Summary of HIED 102x vs. Traditional\Summer Programs.11
Summary of HIED 102x vs. HIED 101x Programs....12
A General Summary of the SRC Item Differences Among the Groups....13
An Analysis of the Academic Performance of the Orientation-Related Groups....14
GPA....14
Honors Status....14
Probationary Status....15
Retention Rates....15
Summary of Academic Performance Findings....16

V. Conclusion....16

VI. Appendix A....19
Significant Differences Among Groups on SRC Subcategories....20

VII. Appendix B....21
Significant Differences on Specific Items of the SRC....22

Abstract

The Effects of Various Types of
Orientation Programming Upon Freshman
Academic Performance and Reaction to College

An quasi-experimental design using four matched groups of entering Oregon State University freshmen investigated the question of whether increasing exposure to differ types of orientation programming would have any effect upon freshman academic performance and reaction to college.

Results indicated that freshmen who participated in each of the four types of orientation programming did not significantly differ on the 19 sub-categories of the Student Reaction to College Survey (SRC). However, individual analysis of the 150 items of the SRC showed students who participated in all four orientation programs were significantly more involved with faculty, were more informed about their progress in courses, reacted more favorably to the registration process, and were less likely to drop classes than students who participated all of the other types of orientation programming. Students attending all types of orientation also had significantly higher grade point averages and were less likely to be under probationary status after their first term on campus. The first year retention rates of freshmen participating in all four types of orientation programming were significantly higher than freshmen who participated in only in pre-registration orientation.

However, students with full exposure to orientation programming also expressed greater dissatisfaction with the quality of student\faculty interaction and were significantly more critical of the supportive aspects of the college and faculty. The investigation indicated that exposure to differ types of orientation programming may significantly influence freshman reaction to college as measured by some items on the Student Reaction to College Survey.

The Effects of Various Types of Orientation Programming Upon Freshman Academic Performance and Reaction to College

Introduction

An quasi-experimental design using four matched groups of entering Oregon State University freshmen was constructed to investigate if various types of orientation programming and increasing levels of exposure to orientation programming would have any effect upon freshman reaction to college following their first term on campus. The study also investigated the effect of orientation-related programming upon freshman academic performance as measured by first term and first year GPA and retention rates.

Oregon State University currently has four types of orientation-related programs for freshmen. These programs include: (1) a week-long orientation given immediately prior to registration (Traditional); (2) a two-day summer orientation program (SOAP); (3) an extended one-hour-credit orientation course taught by trained upperclassmen (HIED 101x); and (4) a one-hour-credit university seminar taught by volunteer faculty and staff (HIED 102x). The availability of these programs provided an excellent opportunity to study the general and additive effects of orientation programming.

Methodology

The university seminar (HIED 102x) began during the fall of 1987. Eight-eight newly enrolled freshmen elected to participate in the course which was offered one hour each week throughout the fall term. Student participants were enrolled in one of eight sections of approximately 12 students and were taught by either a faculty or staff volunteer. All of the university seminar students had also participated in the other three orientation programs. Each of the 88 students enrolling in the seminar was matched on four variables--gender, academic major, high school grade point average, and housing status-- with three additional freshmen who each had participated in a different type of orientation program. A total of 352 freshmen representing 15.2% of the entering freshmen class were selected for investigation. The groups and their type of orientation included the following:

Group 1-Traditional Orientation (N=88)

Students who attended only the fall term pre-registration orientation program.

Group 2-Summer Orientation Program-SOAP-(N=88)

Students who participated in both the fall orientation program and the summer orientation program (SOAP).

Group 3-HIED 101x (N=88)

Students who participated in the fall and summer orientation programs and the first term extended orientation course taught by underclassmen (HIED 101x).

Group 4-HIED 102x (N=88)

Students who participated in the fall and summer orientation programs, the first term extended orientation course (HIED 101x) and the one-hour-credit university seminar course (HIED 102x).

At the conclusion of the fall term, each of the 352 students was asked to complete the Student Reaction to College Survey (SRC). Usable surveys were available for 60 of the 88 matched groups representing 68% of the students surveyed. The percentage of favorable reactions among the four groups were compared on the 19 sub-categories and on each of the 150 items of the SRC. Academic performance including fall term and first year GPA, retention rates, probation percentages, and percentage of students with GPAs of 3.5 or better were also compared among the four groups.

The intent of the study was to determine if increased participation in orientation-related programming would effect freshman reaction to college and freshman year academic performance. It was hypothesize that increased participation would produce more favorable reaction to college and would have a more positive effect upon student academic performance.

Findings of the Study

A Group Comparison on the 19 SRC Sub-Categories

The groups were compared on their reaction to the 19 sub-categories of the SRC. Average percentages of favorable reactions for the four groups (N=60) over the 19 sub-categories are found in Appendix A. A chi-square analysis of the 19 sub-categories showed no significant differences among the four groups in their frequency of favorable reaction to college.

Although the results showed great similarity in the average percentages of favorable reaction to college among the four groups, the student led extended orientation group (HIED 101x) and to some degree the university seminar group (HIED 102x) produced slightly more favorable student reaction to the rules and regulation section of the SRC.

Only three sub-categories of the SRC showed any directional movement as a function of increasing exposure to orientation-related programming and the differences for each of these were extremely small (Table 1). Increased exposure to orientation programming produce more favorable reactions to the involvement with faculty and campus climate categories and added to the unfavorable reactions on the counseling and advising section of the SRC. None of the areas were statistically significant. Thus, increasing exposure to orientation programming had no effect upon the influencing the participants' reaction to the major areas of the SRC.

Table 1

The Percentage of Students Indicating Favorable Reactions to College as a Function of Increased Participation in Orientation-Related Programming.

Student Reaction To College Sub- Category	102x	101x	Soap	Trad
Involvement with Faculty	57	57	55	50
Campus Climate	62	60	59	57
Counseling and Advising	61	61	62	65

Summary of Sub-Category Findings

Additional exposure to orientation-related programming did not have significant effects upon the 19 sub-categories of the SRC. However, there was some indication that exposure to extended orientation programming in general and to the HIED 101x student-led course in particular produced more favorable reactions on the part of the participants to the rules and regulations category. Moreover, there were no significant additive gains on the SRC categories as a result of increasing exposure to orientation-related programming.

A Group Comparison on the Specific Items of the SRC

The four groups were compared on their reactions to each of the 150 items of the SRC to determine if increasing exposure to orientation-related programming would have any significant effect upon participants' reaction to specific items on the SRC. A chi-square analysis comparing the percentage of favorable and unfavorable reaction to the specific items on the SRC showed nine items being significantly different at the .05 level (Table 2).

Table 2

Significant Differences in the SRC Items Among the Groups

	chi-square	significance
1. Instructors have allowed freedom to do assignments	10.28	.0164
2. Registration procedures were a burden	12.79	.0004
3. Have been burden by an administrative error	8.71	.0334
4. Had a problem that I should have received help with but didn't	10.88	.0124
5. Instructors respect students' points of view	10.90	.0123
6. Instructors pile on work	9.55	.0228
7. Required courses in major kept students from taking courses that they wanted	8.13	.0435
8. Took a required course that was a waste of time	12.47	.0005
9. Been prevented from taking a required course in my major field	8.13	.0434

Summary of Group Differences Within SRC Items

Compared to other groups, those students participating in all four types of orientation programming expressed more unfavorable reaction to items concerning instructors (1) allowing freedom on assignments, (2) piling on work, and (3) not respecting student points of view. This group was less encumbered by registration procedures and reacted more favorably to their required courses than students in other groups. Students in the HIED 102x group and students in the traditional orientation group expressed more frustration with the college's inability to help them with a problem. The traditional orientation group was more frustrated by scheduling problems, registration procedures, and their course work. The group having both the traditional and summer programs was most likely to experience an administrative error and was most satisfied with course work in their major area.

Significant SRC Item Differences Between Groups

A chi-square analysis of each SRC item comparing the groups with one another showed 72 significant differences. The following is a summary of these differences as a function of group comparisons. Complete statistical results are found in Appendix B.

Compared to Traditional Orientation Group, the Summer Orientation Group Was:

1. Less likely to take a test to determine what kind of course to take.
2. More likely to believe that instructors explained things in ways that student could understand.
3. More likely to have been inconvenienced by an administrative error.
4. More likely to feel that college personnel helped them with a problem.
5. More certain about college.
6. Less likely to feel that a required course in major kept them from taking courses they liked.
7. Less likely to feel that they took a required course that was a waste of time.
8. Less likely to have had scheduling problem which prevented them from taking a course in their major field.

Summary of Traditional vs. Summer Programs

Summer orientation participants saw college as being significantly more supportive and they were more satisfied with their required courses. The summer group also had fewer scheduling problems and reacted more favorably to their instructors' explanations. They were, however, more inconvenienced by an administrative error(s).

Compared to Traditional and Summer Orientation Group, the HIED 101x Group Was:

9. More unsuccessful in meeting a counselor.
10. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.
11. Less likely to feel that instructors explain things in way that students could understand.
12. More likely to feel that the food services are adequate.
13. More likely to believe that information about the school is easy to get.
14. Less likely to have been burden by the registration process.
15. More likely to feel that students are treated like adults.
16. More likely to favor assignments where students work together.
17. More likely to have participated in a course-related activity off campus.
18. More likely to have dropped a course.
19. More likely to have taken a required course that was a waste of time.
20. More likely to feel that a book or other item would be stolen on campus.
21. More likely to feel that students have a role in deciding what services are paid for by student fees.
22. Less likely to get behind in course(s).

Summary of HIED 101x vs. Traditional\Summer Programs

Students in the HIED 101x course were significantly more supportive of some student services and the role that students play in determining rules, regulations, and fees. They were less likely to get behind in course work despite having more unfavorable reaction to the instructors explanations and to the quality of their major classes. They appeared much more socially and academically involved with the college were more supportive of students working together on class assignments, and felt that infromation was more easily obtainable.

Compared to Traditional Group, the HIED 101x Group Was:

23. More unsuccessful in meeting a counselor.

24. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.

25. More likely to be satisfied with the library services.

26. More likely to feel that the food services are adequate.

27. More likely to believe that information about the school is easy to get.

28. More likely to believe that the college was helpful with a problem.

29. More likely to feel that students are treated like adults.

30. More likely to have dropped a course.

31. More likely to feel that a book or other item would be stolen on campus.

32. More likely to feel that student government effectively represents my point of view.

33. Less likely to get behind in course(s).

Summary of HIED 101x vs. Traditional Programs

Participants in the HIED 101x group were much more supportive of college services and college rules and regulations. They also saw the college as being helpful with student problems and felt better informed about the college. They were less likely to get behind in course work and more likely to believe they were treated like

adults. They were, however, more prone to dropping classes and less successful in accessing counselors than freshmen who participated only in traditional orientation programming.

Compared to the Traditional Orientation Group, the HIED 102x Group Was:

34. More likely to have no trouble concentrating on what they were suppose to be studying.

35. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.

36. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.

37. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.

38. Less likely to have taken a test to decide what courses to take.

39. Less likely to feel that registration process was a burden.

40. Less likely to have been bored in class.

41. More likely to believe that information about the school is easy to get.

42. More likely to feel that students are treated like adults.

43. Less likely to feel that instructors presented more in class than what was learned from assigned readings.

44. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work.

45. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.

46. Less likely to think that a required course prevented me from taking other courses that I liked.

Summary of HIED 102x vs. Traditional Programs

The HIED 102x group was more academically integrated in terms of experiencing less boredom in class and in experiencing more satisfaction with major-related courses. They were significantly more likely to interact with faculty, to see faculty as helpful, and to perceive the rules and regulations of the college as being developed with student consultation. They also felt that they were more likely to be treated as adults and that information about the college was easy to get. However, they were less supportive of faculty and the quality of their instructional methods.

Compared to the Traditional and Summer Orientation Groups, the HIED 102x Group Was:

47. Less likely to think they took a required course that was a waste of time.

48. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.

49. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.

50. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.

51. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work.

52. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.

53. Less likely to get behind in course work.

54. Less likely to believe that instructors explained things in ways that students could understand.

55. Less likely to think instructors have allowed freedom in class assignments.

56. More likely to have talked with instructors about things not connected with class.

57. More likely to believe that instructors don't understand what students are saying.

58. Less likely to feel that they took a required course that was a waste of time.

59. More likely to favor course assignments where students work together.

60. Less likely to feel that instructors respected student points of view.

61. Less likely to favor activities for married and older students.

Summary of HIED 102x vs. Traditional\Summer Programs

The HIED 102x group was significantly more involved with faculty and were more likely to see faculty as helpful. They also were more supportive of the rules and regulations of the college and more likely to feel that information about the college was easy to get.

They were less likely to get behind in course work and more satisfied with their major-related courses. They were, however, less likely be supportive of faculty in terms of their quality of instruction and their interactive skills with freshmen.

Compared to the HIED 101x Group, the HIED 102x Group Was:

62. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.

63. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.

64. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work.

65. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.

66. Less likely to think instructors have allowed freedom in class assignments.

67. More likely to have talked with instructors about things not connected with class.

68. Less likely to feel that instructors respected student points of view.

69. Less likely to feel registration procedures were a burden.

70. More likely to know how well they were doing in courses before grades.

71. More likely to feel that college should have helped them with a problem but didn't.

72. Less likely to have dropped a course.

Summary of HIED 102x vs. HIED 101x Programs

Again, the HIED 102x group was more likely to interact with faculty and to see faculy as helpful with personal and academic problems. HIED 102x participants were less troubled by the registration process, were less likely to drop a course, and were more informed about their academic status in the classroom. However, they were less supportive of faculty in terms of their interactive responses and instructional procedures.

A General Summary of the SRC Item Differences Among the Groups

TRADITIONAL GROUP

This group was significantly less involved with faculty and more unsure about what they were getting from college, felt less able to get help, and found college information difficult to get. In addition, this group had less clarity about their future goals and were less satisfied with college services. They felt more isolated in areas of obtaining help and support and more frustrated with advisement services. They expressed greater displeasure with academic course work and had a higher number of scheduling and advisement problems.

SOAP GROUP

Students in this group were significantly more satisfied with some aspects of the quality and forms of instruction. They displayed higher levels of dissatisfaction with the rules and regulations and more frustration with the availability of college information. They were significantly less involved with faculty, but they appeared to be more satisfied with course work. They were less socially integrated in expressing less interaction with faculty and little involvement with campus activities. They experienced far fewer scheduling and advisement problems and were more sure about their place in college than traditional group members.

HIED 101x GROUP

The student-led group displayed high levels of satisfaction with student services, although they were less satisfied with the registration process and more frustrated in accessing counselors. They were likely to feel that they were treated as adults and more likely to participate in campus activities. They were significantly more likely to believe that students have a role in making the rules and regulations which affect them. They showed more confusion about what courses to take and were more likely to drop courses. However, they were significantly less likely to get behind in their course work. They felt that information about college was easy to get and the college was supportive in helping studnets with problems. They were more supportive of cooperative in-class assignments. However, they did feel more vulnerable to thief on campus.

HIED 102x GROUP

The group having the full array of orientation-related programming exhibited significantly high levels of faculty involvement and satisfaction in getting information about the college. They expressed a high degree of dissatisfaction with the quality and form of instruction on some of the SRC items. They indicated a high preference for cooperative in-class assignments. Although they interacted with faculty more than the other groups, they expressed higher levels of dissatisfaction with the quality faculty interaction--especially in having faculty understand student points of view. They paralleled the traditional orientation group in believing that the college was not as responsive to student problems as it should have been.

An Analysis of the Academic Performance of the Orientation-Related Groups

GPA

A one-way analysis of variance comparing the first term and first year GPAs of the four orientation-related groups is indicated in Table 3. The groups showed significant differences in both the first term and first year GPA. A multiple comparison test showed that the HIED 102x group scored significantly higher GPAs than either the traditional or the HIED 101x group.

Table 3

Grade Point Average for Orientation-Related Groups

Time Period	Trad	SOAP	HIED 101x	HIED 102x	ANOVA value
First Term	2.49	2.66	2.50	2.81	9.38*
First Year	2.43	2.69	2.56	2.93	11.03*

*significant .05

Honors Status

A chi-square analysis of the groups' percentage of students with GPAs greater than 3.50 shows no significant differences in first term nor the first year percentage of students earning more than GPAs of 3.50 (Table 4).

Table 4

Percentage of Participants With GPAs Greater Than 3.5

Time Period	Trad	n	SOAP	n	HIED 101x	n	HIED 102x	n	Chi-sq
First Term	9%	8	8%	7	11%	10	17%	15	1.24
First Year	8%	7	9%	8	12%	11	18%	16	1.17

Probationary Status

A chi-square analysis of students with GPAs of 2.00 or less shows a significant difference in the first term and in the first year among the groups (Table 5). HIED 102x group members were less likely to earn grades under 2.00 at the conclusion of their first term and year on campus.

Table 5

Percentage of Participants with GPA's Less than 2.00

Time Period	Trad	n	SOAP	n	HIED 101x	n	HIED 102x	n	Chi-sq
First Term	22%	19	15%	13	21%	18	7%	6	8.32*
First Year	26%	23	14%	12	22%	19	7%	6	12.19*

*significant at .05

Retention Rates

A chi-square analysis was conducted to determine if student retention rates were affected by the degree of orientation-related exposure (Table 6). No significant differences were found, although

there was a slight tendency for students having the full array of programming (HIED 102x) to have higher retention rates following their first year.

Table 6

Retention Percentage of Participants

Time Period	Trad	n	SOAP	n	HIED 101x	n	HIED 102x	n	Chi-sq
First Term	93%	82	96%	84	94%	83	96%	84	.009
First Year	85%	75	91%	80	89%	78	96%	84	.695

Summary of Academic Performance Findings

Students experiencing the full-array of orientation-related programming achieved significantly higher first year GPAs and significantly lower percentages of participants with GPAs of less than 2.0. The additive value of having freshmen participate in a full array of orientation programming which culminated with a faculty or staff led freshman seminar seemed to make a significant difference in freshman academic performance. On-the-other-hand freshmen having only the pre-registration orientation were most vulnerable to attrition and low grade point performance

Conclusion

Students participating in the full array of orientation-related programming were significantly more involved with faculty, felt that information was easier to obtain, were less likely to get behind in their studies, were more supportive of cooperative educational assignments in their classes, had significantly higher GPAs after their first year, and were significantly less likely to obtain GPAs of less than 2.0 after their first term and first year. They expressed more favorable reactions to the rules and regulations of

the campus and were significantly more satisfied with courses in their major. They felt that they were more likely to be treated as adults at least compared to groups not participating in extended orientation courses. However, they were significantly less satisfied with the quality of student\faculty interaction and much more critical of the instructional methods of the faculty.

Students who participated in the student-led orientation course together with other traditional orientation programming expressed greater satisfaction with the rules and regulations of the campus. They felt that they were significantly better informed than students in the traditional and summer orientation groups. The student-led extended orientation group indicated more satisfaction with student services and with student government. They were significantly more likely to participate in course-related off campus activities and they were more likely to feel that they were treated as adults. They were less likely to feel left behind in their course work. None of these factors, however, seem to contribute to enhanced academic performance. While they appeared to be more social integrated with the campus, they also were less involved with faculty than the HIED 102 group. They did not, however, express the high levels of dissatisfaction with the quality of student\faculty interaction as did the HIED 102x group.

The group having the traditional and summer orientation expressed high levels of satisfaction with their courses and course work. However, they experienced greater stress with academic work-particularly in trying to keep pace. While expressing some high levels of academic integration, they reported lower levels of social integration. They were significantly less likely to participate in campus activities and were less satisfied with student services and with the rules and regulations of the campus. They also were less involved with the faculty than the HIED 102x group, although they were more satisfied with the quality of that interaction. None of these factors, however, seem to have any affect on enhancing their academic performance.

The traditional orientation group expressed significantly higher levels of dissatisfaction with their course work, student services, and the rules and regulations of the campus. They were significantly less involved with faculty and were less supportive of their course work within their major. They expressed a high level of dissatisfaction with their academic schedules and felt more frustration with the administrative process. They were far more confused about their role in college and more dissatisfied with the college's ability to help them with their problems. They had significantly lower GPAs after their first term and first year and a significantly higher percentage of students in this group obtained GPAs of under 2.00 during their freshman year.

Campuses which utilize a student-led extended orientation course to supplement traditional programming may derive considerable benefits in enhancing freshman social integration. This study appears to show that participants in such courses are more actively involved in campus activities and express greater satisfaction with student services, with the rules and regulations of the campus, and with the communicative links between students and the college. However, a student-led course may not result in substantial gains in freshman academic performance or enhance retention rates-at least during the first year. This particular study showed student leaders to be less effective in stimulating student\faculty involvement and in helping students with their academic performance. The HIED 101x course stressed the collegiality of the campus and did not emphasize faculty\student interaction nor academic preparation or skill building. The course did have some major effects upon promoting student involvement with the campus and in promoting favorable reactions toward the campus activities. These in return may have some long-range benefits in increasing student commitment to the college.

The faculty-led course can also be a powerful addition to the campus as seen in its influence on enhancing student academic performance and in the producing greater student\faculty interaction for freshmen. However, this study shows that such potential for interaction can result in greater student dissatisfaction as they encounter faculty. Students may be less satisfied with faculty's accessibility, sincerity, understanding, and concern for them as students.

The interaction between the student-led and faculty-led programming clearly shows that in combination they can produce added value in socially and academically integrating freshmen into the campus milieu. The results of such integration is a better informed and significantly more productive student in terms of GPA and in limiting the percentage of students who obtain GPAs under 2.00 during their freshman year.

Appendix A

Significant Differences Among Groups on the SRC Subcategories

SRC Category\Item	Traditional	SOAP	HIED 101x	HIED 102x	chi-square	significance
Organized Student Activities	29	31	38	30	1.085	.781
Programming	69	74	65	71	.979	.806
Grading	57	60	49	57	.973	.808
Help with Living Arrangements	32	34	40	32	.944	.815
Registration\Scheduling	66	59	62	62	.889	.828
Quality of Instruction	70	74	75	69	.870	.845
Rules and Regulations	30	30	47	40	.543	.909
Instructor Accessibility	66	61	62	58	.465	.926
Studying	50	54	56	52	.436	.933
Academic Performance	52	56	54	52	.336	.953
Financial and Related Problems	69	72	75	71	.329	.954
Planning	64	64	64	59	.315	.957
Form of Instruction	55	55	59	54	.304	.959
Involvement with Faculty	50	55	57	57	.301	.960
Library\Bookstore	77	79	85	82	.288	.962
Student-Centered Instruction	46	43	43	42	.169	.982
Counseling and Advising	65	62	61	61	.144	.986
Campus Climate	57	59	60	62	.069	.995
Administrative Procedures	51	50	54	54	.033	.998

Appendix B

Significant Differences on Specific Items of the SRC

SUMMER ORIENTATION PROGRAM VS. TRADITIONAL ORIENTATION

Compared to the Traditional Group, the Summer Group was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. Less likely to take a test to determine what kind of course to take.	4.80	.0285
2. More likely to believe that instructors explained things in ways that students could understand.	6.18	.0132
3. More likely to have been inconvenienced by an administrative error.	10.18	.0001
4. More likely to feel that college personnel helped with a problem.	5.17	.0230
5. More certain about college.	5.40	.0201
6. Less likely to feel that a required course in major kept them from taking they liked.	5.40	.0201
7. Less likely to feel that they took a required course that was a waste of time.	12.48	.00004
8. Less likely to have had scheduling problem which prevented them from taking a course in their major field.	5.40	.0201

HIED 101x vs. TRADITIONAL AND SUMMER ORIENTATION GROUP

Compared to Traditional and Summer Orientation Group, the HIED 101x Group Was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. More unsuccessful in meeting a counselor.	7.26	.0007
2. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.	6.55	.0105
3. Less likely to feel that instructors explain things in way that students could understand.	4.44	.0350
4. More likely to feel that the food services are adequate.	6.54	.0105
5. More likely to believe that information about the school is easy to get.	4.89	.0271
6. Less likely to have been burden by the registration process.	4.89	.0271
7. More likely to feel that students are treated like adults.	4.91	.0267
8. More likely to favor assignments where students work together.	6.56	.0105
9. More likely to have participated in a course-related activity off campus.	5.71	.0168
10. More likely to have dropped a course.	5.40	.0201
11. More likely to have taken a required course that was a waste of time.	6.14	.0132

12. More likely to feel that a book or other item would be stolen on campus.	4.10	.0428
13. More likely to feel that students have a role in deciding what services are paid for by student fees.	5.56	.0183
14. Less likely to get behind in course(s).	9.19	.0002

HIED 101x vs. TRADITIONAL ORIENTATION GROUP

Compared to Traditional Orientation Group, the HIED 101x Group Was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. More unsuccessful in meeting a counselor.	5.56	.0183
2. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.	6.55	.0105
3. More likely to be satisfied with the library services	5.17	.0230
4. More likely to feel that the food services are adequate.	6.54	.0105
5. More likely to believe that information about the school is easy to get.	4.89	.0271
6. More likely to believe that the college was helpful with a problem	9.60	.0002
7. More likely to feel that students are treated like adults.	6.71	.0010
8. More likely to have dropped a course.	5.40	.0201

9. More likely to feel that a book or other item would be stolen on campus.	4.10	.0428
10. More likely to feel that student government effectively represents my point of view	6.91	.0009
11. Less likely to get behind in courses.	3.85	.0497

HIED 102x vs. TRADITIONAL AND SUMMER ORIENTATION GROUP

Compared to the Traditional and Summer Orientation Group, the HIED 102x Group was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. Less likely to think they took a required course that was a waste of time.	6.14	.0132
2. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.	5.40	.0201
3. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.	5.17	.0230
4. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.	11.05	.0001
5. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work .	13.30	.0001
6. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.	5.00	.0254
7. Less likely to get behind in course work.	5.00	.0254

8. Less likely to believe that instructors explained things in ways that students could understand.	6.14	.0132
9. Less likely to think instructors have allowed freedom in class assignments.	6.91	.0008
10. More likely to have talked with instructors about things not connected with class.	4.82	.0281
11. More likely to believe that instructors didn't understand what I was saying.	8.53	.0003
12. Less likely to feel that they took a required course that was a waste of time.	6.14	.0132
13. More likely to favor course assignments where students work together.	13.39	.0001
14. Less likely to feel that instructors respected student points of view.	7.55	.0006
15. Less likely to favor activities for married and older students.	4.89	.0271

HIED 102x vs. TRADITIONAL ORIENTATION GROUP

Compared to the Traditional Orientation Group, the HIED 102x Group was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. More likely to have no trouble concentrating on what they were suppose to be studying.	3.98	.0460
2. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.	5.40	.0201

3. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.	5.17	.0230
4. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.	11.05	.00008
5. Less likely to have taken a test to decide what courses to take.	4.80	.0285
6. More likely to feel that the registration process was a burden.	5.40	.0201
7. Less likely to have been bored in class.	5.40	.0201
8. More likely to believe that information about the school was easy to get.	6.72	.0010
9. More likely to believe that students are treated like adults.	4.44	.0350
10. More likely to feel the instructors presented more in class than what was learned from reading assignments.	5.40	.0201
11. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work.	5.40	.0201
12. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.	8.69	.0003
13. Less likely to think that a required course prevented me from taking other courses that I liked.	7.55	.0006

HIED 102x vs. TRADITIONAL AND SUMMER ORIENTATION GROUP

Compared to the Traditional and Summer Orientation Group, the HIED 102x Group was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. Less likely to think they took a required course that was a waste of time.	6.14	.0132
2. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.	5.40	.0201
3. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.	5.17	.0230
4. More likely to feel that rules and regulations are made with the consultation of students.	11.05	.0001
5. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work.	13.30	.0001
6. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.	5.00	.0254
7. Less likely to get behind in course work.	5.00	.0254
8. Less likely to believe that instructors explained things in ways that students could understand.	6.14	.0132
9. Less likely to think instructors have allowed freedom in class assignments.	6.91	.0008
10. More likely to have talked with instructors about things not connected with class.	4.82	.0281

11. More likely to believe that instructors didn't understand what I was saying.	8.53	.0003
12. Less likely to feel that they took a required course that was a waste of time.	6.14	.0132
13. More likely to favor course assignments where students work together.	13.39	.0001
14. Less likely to feel that instructors respected student points of view.	7.55	.0006

HIED 102x vs. HIED 101x

Compared to the HIED 101x Group, the HIED 102x Group Was:

SRC item	chi-square	significance
1. More likely to get help with course work from a faculty outside of class.	5.40	.0201
2. More likely to have got help from a faculty member with a problem I was having with college.	5.17	.0231
3. More likely to feel that instructors piled on work.	7.55	.0006
4. More likely to have bought a useless textbook.	6.72	.0010
5. Less likely to think instructors have allowed freedom in class assignments.	6.91	.0009
6. More likely to have talked with instructors about things not connected with class.	4.82	.0281

7. Less likely to feel that instructors respected student points of view.	10.16	.0001
8. Less likely to feel registration procedures were a burden.	10.81	.0001
9. More likely to know how well they were doing in courses before grades.	6.60	.0102
10. More likely to feel that college should have helped them with a problem but didn't.	5.71	.0168
11. Less likely to have dropped a course.	7.55	.0006

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 21,1991